REMARKS

Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62 have been rejected. Claims 1, 17 – 20, 34 and 49 are now amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-40, 49-59, 61 and 62, under U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Zuk et al (US Patent Publication No. 20030154399 A1), referred herein after as 'Zuk', in light of Singh, US Patent Application No. 10/656,440.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that both the predetermined information items whose distribution it is desired to control and the information sequence it is desired to scan, are changed into a format that facilitates fast comparison. A comparison is then made between the two based on the format and if a match is found then the original texts are compared to decide whether the material it is desired to control is actually present in the information sequence.

The format that facilitates fast comparison includes for example canonical form, a numerical form, hashing, and is specifically supported in the specification at page 16 lines 6 and 7. The passage pointed out specifically teaches a format that facilitates fast comparison, and the examples that follow list specific alternative embodiments of such a format.

In addition the claim has been amended to include the additional step that once the initial comparison using the format that facilitates fast comparison has successfully indicated a match, than actual textual comparison is carried out. That is to say the format to facilitate fast search is only provided as a technical means to rapidly converge to likely matches, but is not itself trusted to make the final match.

Such a final stage would not be relevant to Zuk, who is merely checking for protocol anomalies and in any case is trying to prevent intrusions from hackers. In looking for harmful packets, exact text comparison is useless.

Furthermore the Examiner's suggestions regarding the presence of claimed features in Zuk is also challenged.

Paragraph 10 refers to spoofing of IP addresses. It merely teaches translating of source addresses to different source addresses. However as is well known to the skilled person, all IP addresses are in a *single format*, so there is *no question* of *a first*

format and a canonical format, even less so a format conducive to rapid searching – since both formats are *equally susceptible* to searching. Furthermore contrary to the requirement of the claim, the whole point of paragraph 10 is that the information (of the original address) *is lost*, whereas the claim requires that information *is preserved*. That is to say paragraph 10 fails to teach the claimed requirement of meaning being preserved.

This point was made in the previous response, and the Examiner's position was simply repeated in the present response without any explanation.

Conclusion regarding claim 1

Zuk does not teach comparing an incoming data stream to see if it contains prestored data items using the method of converting the prestored data items into a format conducive to rapid search, converting the incoming stream into the same format, comparing the two using the format conducive to rapid search, and then where the search indicates positive results, comparing using the original text.

Singh does not add to Zuk because Singh simply provides a mapping scheme for creating and storing electronic documents. There is no searching based on Singh's canonical format and even if there is, it is not followed up by comparison of any original text.

Corresponding amendments have been made to independent claim 49, which is believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable as being dependent on allowable main claims.

The remaining claims mentioned in this section of the Office Action are believed to be allowable as being dependent on an allowable main claim.

All of the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with and are believed to have been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable.

An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: September 17, 2008

Enclosures:

- Petition for Extension(Two Months)